

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

LISA LEE SHILOH,	:	1:14-cv-860
	:	
Petitioner,	:	
	:	Hon. John E. Jones III
v.	:	
	:	
JOYCE WILKES, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	Hon. Karoline Mehalchick
	:	
Respondents.	:	

ORDER

September 14, 2015

AND NOW, upon consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Karoline Mehalchick (Doc. 29), recommending that Petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus (Doc. 1) be denied and dismissed with prejudice, and that a certificate of appealability should not issue, and after an independent review of the record, and noting that Petitioner filed objections¹ (Doc. 30) to the report on September 9, 2015 and the Court finding

¹ Where objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation are filed, the court must perform a *de novo* review of the contested portions of the report. *Supinski v. United Parcel Serv.*, Civ. A. No. 06-0793, 2009 WL 113796, at *3 (M.D. Pa. Jan. 16, 2009) (citing *Sample v. Diecks*, 885 F.2d 1099, 1106 n. 3 (3d Cir. 1989); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c)). "In this regard, Local Rule of Court 72.3 requires 'written objections which . . . specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objection is made and the basis for those objections.'" *Id.* (citing *Shields v. Astrue*, Civ. A. No. 07-417, 2008 WL 4186951, at *6 (M.D. Pa. Sept. 8, 2008)).

Judge Mehalchick's analysis to be extremely thorough, well-reasoned, and fully supported by the record, and the Court further finding Plaintiff's objections to be without merit² and squarely addressed by Judge Mehalchick's report **IT IS**

HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Mehalchick (Doc. 29) is **ADOPTED** in its entirety.
2. Petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus (Doc. 1) is **DENIED** and **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.
3. The Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.
4. The Clerk of Court shall **CLOSE** the file on this case.

s/ John E. Jones III
John E. Jones III
United States District Judge

² Petitioner's objections to the R&R contain no arguments that cause us to part company with the Magistrate Judge's thoughtfully considered recommendations. As correctly noted by the Magistrate Judge, the claims asserted by Petitioner in her petition are either procedurally defaulted or entirely non-cognizable (i.e. ineffective assistance of PCRA counsel). Accordingly, the recommendation to deny and dismiss this petition is entirely appropriate and we adopt the Magistrate Judge's reasoning in whole by adopting her recommendations.